

United States Patent and Trademark Office



APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/869,321	10/18/2001	Yanling Zhou	211598US2	1536
22850	7590 07/05/2002			
OBLON SPIVAK MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT PC			EXAMINER	
	SON DAVIS HIGHWA	HWAY	PAIK, SANG YEOP	
ARLINGIU	N, VA 22202		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3742	
			DATE MAILED: 07/05/2002	2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1	C	١
•_	•	,

Applicant(s) Application No. ZHOU, YANLING 09/869.321 Office Action Summary Art Unit Examiner 3742 Sang Y Paik -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). **Status** Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 April 2002. 1)🛛 This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 2a)⊠ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. **Disposition of Claims** 4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. **Application Papers** 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner. If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action. 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application). a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121. Attachment(s) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 9. 6) Other:

Art Unit: 3742

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 10, 14, 16, 19, 21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Allen (US 4,057,707).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 1-4, 7-11, 14-16, 19-21, 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito et al (US 6,072,162) in view of Allen (US 4,057,707).

Ito et al shows all the structure claimed including a AlN ceramic substrate, a resistance heating element comprising one or more circuits on a surface of the ceramic substrate. However, Ito et al does not show an insulating covering over the heating element.

Allen shows a heating element comprising one or more circuits arranged on a ceramic substrate with an insulation layer comprising oxide glass material that covers the two or more heating circuits in a lump.

Art Unit: 3742

In view of Allen, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adapt

Ito et al with an insulating covering to further protect the heating element from cracking or

peeling.

5. Claims 5, 6, 12, 13, 17, 18, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito et al in view of Allen as applied to claims 1-4, 7-11, 14-16, 19-21, 24-27 above, and further in view of Ishiguro (US 5,321,386) or Paquet et al (US 5,822,675).

Ito et al in view of Allen discloses all the structure claimed except the insulation covering made of a heat resistant resin material such as a polyimide resin or a silicone resin.

Ishiguro shows that it is known in the art to use a glass material or polyimide resin material as the protective insulating layer to a heating resistor to protect the resistor since such material provides a good heat resistance as well as liquid leakage protection. Paquet et al also shows that a silicone resin provides a good electrical insulation that can withstand a high temperature.

In view of Ishiguro or Paquet et al, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adapt Ito et al, as modified by Allen, with the insulating cover made of a polyimide resin or a silicone resin to protect the heater that can also provide a good heat resistance as well as good electrical insulation.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

With respect to Allen, the applicant argues that the heating device in Allen is not a device to be used in the semiconductor industry because unlike the ceramic heater in the semiconductor

Art Unit: 3742

filed, the prevention of changes in the resistance value with time and the heat retaining property on the heating face are not required for the cooking devices. This argument is not deemed persuasive since there is no such distinction is recited in the claims and the claimed structure is also clearly met by Allen. The ceramic heater in Allen is not limited to cooking devices only, and there is no reason why the device of Allen cannot be used in heating a semiconductor wafer.

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sang Y Paik whose telephone number is 703-308-1147. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-5:30) First Friday Off.

Art Unit: 3742

,321 Page 5

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Teresa Walberg can be reached on 703-308-1327. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-3463 for regular communications and 703-305-3463 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0861.

SIPL

Sang Y Paik Primary Examiner Art Unit 3742

syp June 30, 2002